

disconnected from the antenna feed circuitry and the internal antenna is connected.
1 The internal antenna 20 functions as a primary antenna while the retractable antenna
functions as a secondary antenna." The Examiner infers from this statement that the
retractable antenna provides signal-strengthening support to the internal antenna by
5 being electrically connected to the internal antenna. Moreover, the Examiner cites claim
10 which states that an external, retractable antenna is movably mounted on the
internal antenna and is movable between a retracted position and an extended position.
The Examiner believes that this language further indicates that the external antenna is
connected to the internal antenna.

10 Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Contrary to the Examiner's
statements, the Examiner's inferences are unfounded. The specification specifically
states that a switching mechanism switches the internal antenna out of circuit and
switches the external antenna in circuit when the external antenna is in an extended
15 position. The specification further teaches that when the external retractable antenna is
retracted, it is disconnected from the antenna feed circuitry and the internal antenna is
connected. It is inherently evident from the above language that the retractable antenna
does not work as a signal booster as claimed by the Examiner. The Examiner's
assumption would make the applicant's disclosed structure counterproductive, because,
20 as stated above, applicant's teaches that turning one of the antennas on turns the other
antenna off. The applicant's language cited by the Examiner merely means that the
user will use the internal antenna first. If the signal then fades, the user can extend the
whip antenna which will turn the internal antenna off and the external antenna on. The

1 user is switching antennas, not boosting the antenna. As to the Examiner's concerns
with claim 10, applicant notes that the external antenna is mechanically connected to
the internal antenna. It is not taught or otherwise suggested that the internal and
external antenna are electrically connected. Accordingly, applicant believes that claims
5 7-13 do not introduce new matter as claimed by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 6, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Matai. The Examiner contends that Matai teaches all the limitations
of the claims except for the transceiver circuit. The Examiner argues that it would have
been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to
10 know that Matai's radio circuit would have performed the same tasks as a transceiver
circuit, and that Matai's use of the phrase "radio circuit" is analogous with the applicant's
phrase "transceiver circuit."

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claims 5 and 10 are
15 independent claims with claims 6 and 12 depending therefrom, respectively. There is
no suggestion in Matai that the antenna device can be modified in the manner proposed
by the Examiner. Furthermore, the Examiner's proposed modification of Matai would
not meet the limitations of independent claims 5 and 10. Claims 5 and 10 specifically
recite that an external, retractable antenna is movably mounted on the internal antenna.
20 As further depicted in the drawings, the antennas are mechanically attached together.
Furthermore, claims 5 and 10 describe that the antennas are independent from each
other. Claims 5 and 10 state that the internal antenna is in circuit with the transceiver
when the external antenna is in the retracted (out of circuit) position. The internal

1 antenna is out of circuit with the transceiver when the external antenna is in the
extended (in circuit) position. It is not taught, suggested or shown in any manner that
the two antennas are electrically dependent.

5 Contrary to the present invention, Matai specifically shows that the internal and
external antennas are attached to opposite sides or between a PCB. Therefore, as
further depicted in the figures of Matai, the retractable antenna is not movably mounted
on the internal antenna as specifically claimed in the present invention. Furthermore,
Matai specifically teaches that the two antennas are electrically dependent upon each
other. Matai teaches that the "metal fitting 123 is electrically connected with the metal
10 fitting 124 through the external antenna element 212 . . . By virtue of this input, an input
of the radio selection circuit 134 is connected to the feed section (a) of the internal
antenna means 111 to 114, thus the internal antenna means 111 to 114 comes into
use." Therefore, even if Matai was modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner,
15 the Examiner's proposed combination would not meet the limitations of independent
claims 5 and 10. Accordingly, claims 5 and 10 are patentably distinct from the
Examiner's proposed modification of Matai.

20 Regarding claims 6 and 12 of the present invention, claims 6 and 12 recite that a
switching mechanism selectively connects either the external antenna or the internal
antenna to the transceiver circuit. Applicant believes that Matai does not teach or
otherwise suggest the switching mechanism as taught in the present invention.
Furthermore, claims 6 and 12 depend from claims 5 and 10, respectively, Claims 5 and
10 are allowable as set forth above. Insofar as claims 6 and 12 depend from
25

independent claims 5 and 10, the same are thought to be allowable. Accordingly,
claims 6 and 12 are believed to be patentably distinct from the Examiner's proposed
modification of Matai.

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 8, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
being unpatentable over Matai as applied to claims 5 and 10 above and further in view
of Chang. The Examiner contends that Matai teaches all of the terms of the claims
except for a remote RF port. The Examiner further contends that Chang teaches such a
remote RF port. Therefore the Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one
of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to add to Matai's disclosure
Chang's RF port so that another antenna may be connected to Matai's radio device to
increase its received signal strength or to possibly utilize the port as an output port for
another device that may be connected to Matai's communications device.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention for the following
reasons. First, there is no suggestion in either of the references that they may be
combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Second, the Examiner's proposed
combination would not meet the limitations of the claims. Claims 3, 4, 8, 11 and 14
specifically recite that an internal antenna is mechanically connected to a remote RF
port. Contrary to the Examiner's argument, Chang does not teach in any manner that
an internal antenna is mechanically connected to a remote RF port. Chang teaches that
an electrical connector is connected to a PCB. Third, the Examiner's argument
depends from the Examiner's above 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) argument. Claims 3, 4, 8, 11
and 14 ultimately depend from independent claims 5 and 10, respectively. Independent

1 claims 5 and 10 are allowable for the reasons set forth above. Insofar as claims 3, 4, 8,
11 and 14 ultimately depend from claims 5 and 10, the same are thought to be
allowable. Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 8, 11 and 14 are patentably distinct from the
Examiner's proposed combination of Matai and Chang.

5 In light of the above remarks, applicant asserts that the claims are in condition for
allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 3-
14.

10 No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this
amendment; however, please consider this a request for any extension inadvertently
omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 502093.

Respectfully submitted,



15 DENNIS L. THOMTE
Registration No. 22,497
THOMTE, MAZOUR & NIEBERGALL
Attorneys of Record

Suite 1111, 2120 South 72nd Street
Omaha, NE 68124
(402) 392-2280

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

20 I hereby certify that the original of this AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL REJECTION
for JONATHAN L. SULLIVAN, Serial No. 09/477,954, was mailed by first class mail,
postage prepaid, to Box AF, Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C.
20231, on this 13th day of June, 2002.



25 DENNIS L. THOMTE